

S P E E C H
OF THE
HON. SYDENHAM MOORE,
OF ALABAMA,

THIRTY-FIFTH CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION.

ADMISSION OF KANSAS.

CAGE
F615
M66
1858

DEBATE IN THE HOUSE, *Thursday, March 25, 1858.*

The House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the message of the President, the reports of the committees of the two Houses, and the many able speeches which have been already made in favor of the admission of Kansas, have fully exhausted the subject, and swept away all the flimsy pretexts and excuses of those who oppose that measure.

Some have the candor to admit, what all know to be true, that if her constitution did not tolerate domestic slavery, no serious opposition would have been made to her admission. Those who advocated the adoption of the Topeka constitution, as the Black Republicans all did, cannot, without the grossest hypocrisy, pretend to have serious scruples on account of any irregularities in this of Lecompton. I should not, at this late period, have engaged in the discussion of this question, important as I regard its decision, but for the allusions which have been repeatedly made to Alabama, and more especially in the speech of the honorable gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. FARNSWORTH,] the other day, who, not satisfied with indulging in the tirade against the institution of slavery, which has been heard from day to day from that side of the Chamber, saw fit to single out Alabama, and, with a view to disparage her people, instituted a comparison between that State and his own.

First, he says, Alabama has not increased as rapidly as Illinois in population. Is not that easily explained? The census returns show that Illinois had, in 1850, of her then population, 111,860 foreigners, while Alabama had but 7,498. The former being in close proximity to the old and densely populated States of the North, would also account in part for this.

Next, as to the number of children at school: he says, in Alabama there are 62,846 pupils and students at schools; while in Illinois there were, at the same time, 182,292. Out of about 190,000 white persons between five and twenty years of age, Alabama had, in fact, 100,000 at school; while in Illinois there were 350,000 white persons between five and twenty, and of these only 140,000 at school. But the gentleman, very adroitly, dropped the comparison between Alabama and Illinois when he came to speak of the number of persons over twenty-one years who could not read or write, and then contrasts Alabama with Massachusetts. I prefer to continue the comparison which he commenced with Illinois. In 1850, there were in Alabama 33,757 persons over twenty-one who could not read or write, while in Illinois there were 40,000. In Illinois there were 978,855 acres of public land appropriated for educational purposes, while in Alabama there were 902,775; and the lands of Illinois, it is well known, were far richer. Alabama had, in 1850, 1,375 churches, while Illinois had but 1,223.

The gentleman from Illinois sneeringly comments upon these results of the census as to the education of the masses in Alabama, and asserts that there are multitudes in all the slaveholding States who "cannot even read their ballots, nor sign their names to a poll-book." Does he not know that a large portion of the population of many of the States, at the period of our Revolution, were unlettered men? And yet what nobler examples of heroism and intelligent appreciation of popular rights has history anywhere afforded us? Was Rome much indebted to the literary cultivation of her masses for the sturdy virtues and practical wisdom which secured to her, for so many ages, the conquest and government of the world? Did not some, even, of the feudal barons who wrested the great charter from King John, make their marks, being unable to append their signatures?

The gentleman ventures these sneers against the hardy yeomanry of the South, with whom it is at other times the favorite policy of his party to claim an affiliation against what they call the slaveholding aristocracy of the South. The scorn with which the masses of the South have ever rejected these insidious appeals is a sufficient proof of the intelligent and unselfish patriotism of those free and independent citizens. Though they may have been denied the advantages of early education, by living in a new and sparsely-settled country, this comparative want of education and of book-learning, is less to be regretted if they have thereby escaped the follies of free-love associations, of spiritualism, and the thousand infidelities which prevail in New England. Remote from crowded cities, engaged in agricultural pursuits, compelled, in their solitude, to study the great book of nature, gathering information at church, in the jury-box, at the political hustings and in the practical business of life, their store of knowledge is not

always seant ; but this, above all, they have not been contaminated even by the suspicion of corruption, and always make the best, the bravest soldiers in the world.

The gentleman who has just taken his seat [Mr. THAYER] taunts us with the want of that commerce and mannfacturing industry which we have so long assisted the North in establishing. It is another illustration of our freedom in the past from sectional jealousies, as it is also of our fond illusion that we had yet a part in David, and an inheritance in the son of Jesse.

And why, let me ask, should there be perpetual strife between us ? Why should this relentless war be waged against the South ? Does not the chief produet of our slave labor keep in motion the spindles of Massachusetts, and create there an increased demand for your labor ? We offer you a market for your manufactured goods, employment for your ships, and encouragement to your ship builders. Every additional plow which is driven into the soil of Alabama, and each cargo that is landed at Mobile, give an increased impetus to your various manufae-tures.

The time was, Mr. Chairman, and at no remote period in our history, when the Representatives of the people, from the various sections of this Union, were wont to meet together to consult, to deliberate for the welfare of a common country. Party feeling might, at times, run high ; differences might arise as to questions of domestic or foreign policy, or as to the true construction of the Constitution ; but in these things all were agreed—namely, in recognizing the binding obligations of the Constitution in all its parts, in attachment for the Union, and in reverence for the decisions of our judicial tribunals. What a echange has taken place in a few years ! Now sons of one common and glorious lineage are here seen pitted like gladiators, or ranged apart as delegates of hostile nations. But little has been heard during the four months of the session save violent philippies, day after day, against the South, her people, and her institutions, and occasionally reerimination and retaliation on the other side. The stormy sessions of the National Assembly of France scarcely indicated more hostile feeling between the different parties than has been manifested here.

If what we see here is a reflex of the state of feeling among the masses of the North, then it requires no prophet to tell that this Union cannot much longer endure. The crusade so long preached against the South has, it seems, maddened and estranged the North, and has at last aroused the South to the dangers that menace her. A little while ago the young adventurer from the North would often seek his home in the South, and, when deserving, never failed to meet with friends, with promotion, and advancement. The distinguished gentleman who sits

before me, [Mr. QUITMAN]—the Chevalier Bayard—“without fear and without reproach,” and whose military and civil services have won for him a national fame, stands a shining example of this; so do the honorable gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. CRAIG,] and the honorable gentleman from Tennessee, [Mr. MAYNARD,] and many in distinguished positions all over the South.

Then the southern man and the northern man could kneel at the same altars and meet around the same communion table; but now the slave-holder is accursed in the estimation of these Pharisees who “have stolen the livery of the court of Heaven to serve the Devil in,” and his presence would pollute their altars. Then kindly intercourse existed, and the mutual interchange of friendly, if not fraternal feeling. In those days, we of the South felt that the Hancocks, the Otises, and the Warrens of the North, belonged alike to us; and that their glory was also a part of our inheritance. Our youths then went to your renowned institutions of learning, without feeling, as they now would have too much cause to do, in some of them, at least, that they were the veriest hot-beds of treason and fanaticism. Then the southern man felt, as he stepped his foot upon the free soil of the North, that he was still within his own land and among his brethren. He wandered over her battle-fields, read the monuments of her heroes, and exulted in their glorious achievements.

Our pulpits, our work-shops, our factories, our legal and medical professions, our school-houses, all were open to, and many were filled by men from the North. They often married and dwelt among us, thus adding new links to the chain that bound the Union together. Some, after being treated with kindness and hospitality, encouragement and patronage, in their youth, have returned to the North to stir up strife and ill-will between the sections. Prominent among these is a distinguished Senator of New York, who in early life was thus kindly treated and patronized while pursuing the honorable profession of a teacher in a rural district in Georgia. But all kindly recollections of those early days, if any he ever had, have long since been effaced from his memory; and his life has been spent in fomenting sectional strife and ill-will, and in seeking to overturn the institution of slavery, which, he knows, if successful, would result in ruin to the black as well as the white race, and in a disruption of the ties that bind together the States of this Union.

I chanced to hear him recently exulting that there was a North side and a South side in that Chamber and in this—a northern party and a southern party, and expressing the hope that he might live to see the day when the footsteps of a slave would not be seen on this continent. Sir, no love of country prompted that exultation; for he knew too well that, wherever tried, emancipation had proved to be a failure: either

bringing speedy destruction and ruin upon the land where they had been thus emancipated, resulting in the massacre of both races, regardless of age or sex, or, by their slower, but not less sure, decay and ruin in the lapse of time. I never see him, with his bland smile and oily Gammon manner, that I am not reminded of Milton's description of one of the fallen angels:

.. **BELIAL**, in act more graceful and humane;"
 * * * * "he seemed
 For dignity composed and high exploit:
 But all was false and hollow: though his tongue
 Drot manna, and could make the worse appear
 The better reason, to perplex and dash
 Maturest counsels; for his thoughts were low;
 To vice industrious, but to nobler deeds
 Timorous and slothful."

A few—a very few—persons, like the ill-used individual mentioned by the gentleman from Illinois the other day, who was banished from the city of Mobile, abuse the kindness which had been extended to them, and viper-like turn upon their benefactors. How well it becomes that gentleman to express such heartfelt sympathy for the slaves of the South, when his State will not even allow a free negro to tread upon her soil! If one should do so, he may be seized and sold into servitude. He sympathies deeply with the hard lot of our own sleek, well-fed, contented, and happy slaves! But the free black as, hungry, naked and friendless, he stands upon the borders of Illinois, looking wishfully upon her well filled granaries, might exclaim—"I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink; I was a stranger, and ye *took me not in*; naked, and ye clothed me not; sick and in prison, and ye visited me not."

What has brought about this great change to which I have before alluded? Upon whom rests the heavy responsibility? Is it upon those who wage this unjust, unholy, sectional war against their own countrymen? Or is it upon those who have stood up and defended their section when assailed, opposing argument to argument, meeting taunts and insults with scorn, and threats with defiance?

The Abolition party was for years few in numbers and altogether contemptible. But wicked and ambitious men united with it, and drew together in one solid mass the odds and ends of all the old parties—proclaiming for their watchword hostility to the South and its institutions. They seek to array one section against the other, hoping, when that is accomplished, from being superior in numbers, to get the control of the Government and hold us in complete subjection. To effect their unholy purposes, we are abused and misrepresented.

Their orators, their presses, and even their pulpits, are employed in fomenting strife and ill-will by continual denunciation, ridicule, taunts and threats, towards the South; a fair sample of which we have just heard from the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. THAYER.]

These bad men, to gain their ends, have shown that they do not hesitate to trample under foot the Constitution, and nullify the solemn enactments of Congress made to carry out its express provisions, and wholly indifferent to the consequences which may flow from their rashness. The President of the United States, for daring to oppose their unholy designs, notwithstanding his venerable years, his eminent position, his unsullied public and private character is traduced and vilified, his motives aspersed, his patriotism questioned, and he openly and falsely charged with resorting to corruption and bribery, to influence the legislation of Congress. The Supreme Court, too, of the United States—the highest judicial tribunal known in our country—composed of men distinguished for their learning, their exalted wisdom and virtue, whose luminous decisions have added to the national reputation; whom the people reverence and respect for their firmness, their impartiality, and the unsullied purity of their lives, because they will not perjure themselves and mold their decisions to suit this fanatical party, is to be annihilated, or reformed, as they say; while the individual members, including the venerable Chief Justice, are denounced as vile, corrupt, and debased.

For years we of the South have patiently borne these wrongs and injuries. We have warned the people of the North of the inevitable consequences which must follow these attacks; but, with reckless indifference, they still pursue their course of madness, folly, and wickedness. They pretend to think that we of the South will tamely submit; but they are arrogant enough to believe that we will tamely submit, and declare that if we shall resist they will "*whip us into submission.*" The that hemp would be used to ernsh out this spirit of resistance, if any should be manifested. Great Britain threatened this against the thirteen Colonies, all of them, be it remembered, at that time holding slaves; and the gallant Hayne, of South Carolina, was actually hung: but was the proud spirit of the Colonies thereby subdned?

Talk about subduing a sovereign State of this Confederacy! of whipping her into submission! What folly! What kind of a Republic would that be, I should like to know, where one portion of it had to hold the other in subjection by force? A Republic it might be in name, but in fact it would be a pure, unmitigated despotism.

Mr. GILMAN begged to interrupt Mr. MOORE, by asking how it happened that all the threats of separation have proceeded from the South?

Mr MOORE. Sir, I deny the correctness of this assertion, and point to the fact of the Hartford convention, assembled during a war waged for the protection of New England citizens, and in the face of an enemy threatening our coasts. It has never been under such circumstances that the South has chosen to vindicate her violated rights. When the defense of your country, the honor and glory of your empire, were involved, you have nowhere found more obedient and more eminently patriotic citizens. Do you ask me for instances of northern insubordination? Look to the nullification of the laws of Congress by Massachusetts and her surrounding States. When South Carolina threatened to resort to this remedy, she was to be dragooned into submission; when the boasted land of the Pilgrims exerts it, it is perfectly consistent with law, order, and constitutional obligations.

It is openly proclaimed that they intend, under no circumstances, to vote for another slave State. They would crib and confine us to our present limits, saying to us, "thus far shalt thou go, and no further;" knowing that ruin must thereby, if not speedily, yet sooner or later, overtake our fair land. Growing more insolent of late, they boldly proclaim that they intend to rule and govern the South, and thus allow her people none save a mere nominal participation in the administration and control of public affairs. Some, more daring than the rest, openly declare that their purpose is to destroy the institution of slavery and crush out the South, making her a dependent province—her sons "hewers of wood and drawers of water" for northern task-masters. And this is to be the doom, if their designs are consummated, not only of the slave owners, but of all the freemen of the South.

James Watson Webb, who condnets one of the leading Republican presses at the North, hitherto claiming to be moderate and conservative, in his paper of February 20, says:

"If any State should attempt to secede, she will be whipped into subjection. Should they continue refractory, the United States would be compelled ultimately to hold such refractory States as colonies—just as Spain and other European Powers hold their slave colonies—until such time as it might be safe to rely upon their obedience."

And, again, listen to his fierce bombast. It is rich. He says:

"If a Southern State should attempt to resist, she will be made to submit, and bear herself with deference and respect thereafter to those who are morally and socially her equals, and *politically and physically her superiors*, and when provoked to demonstrate it, if needs be, *her masters.*"

Such is the language now employed by the Black Republican presses throughout the North—seeming to verify the old adage, "whom the gods wish to destroy, they first make mad."

Contrast this insolent bravado with the wisdom of Edmund Burke:

"Your instructions and your suspending clauses are the things that hold together the great contexture of this mysterious whole. These things do not make your Government. Dead instruments, passive tools as they are, it is the spirit of the English Constitution which, infused through the mighty mass, pervades, feeds, unites, invigorates, vivifies every part of the empire, even down to the minutest member. It is the love of the people; it is their attachment to their government—from the sense of the deep stake they have in such a glorious institution—which gives you your Army and your Navy, and infuses into both that liberal obedience without which your Army would be a base rabble, and your Navy nothing but rotten timber."

That gentleman [Mr. FARNSWORTH] spoke sneeringly of the republic of Alabama. Let me tell him that Alabama has not yet decided upon her course. She has indulged in no threats; but by the unanimous voice of her Legislature has determined, in case Kansas is rejected, to hold a convention to determine what her honor, her safety, and independence may seem to require. She came into the Union as an equal, and her equality she will never surrender.

Mr. PALMER wished to know by what process it was proposed that Alabama should be withdrawn from the Union.

Mr. MOORE. She has decided, sir, in a contingency which involves the loss of her equality and honor, to assemble a convention to decide upon her course. It is not for me to anticipate that decision; but, if she deem it necessary to dissolve a compact, of which it is openly declared that she shall no longer participate in the advantages, I have no fear that she will not have the intelligence and unanimity to devise the means of her long deferred, reluctant, but compelled withdrawal.

But she still cherishes the hope that her constitutional rights may be respected; that Kansas may be admitted, and peace and quiet restored to the country. I know the sentiments of her people, and especially of those who have honored me with a seat on this floor. They are a law-abiding though proud-spirited people, content with the Constitution and Union which were made and handed down to them by their fathers—attachment to that Union having been a cherished principle of political faith throughout the South. What but this caused her people to submit for so many years to a high protective tariff, by which her industry was taxed to enrich the North? What but this caused her to submit to be robbed of her slaves annually to the value of thousands of dollars? What but this induced her to acquiesce in those measures by which the North obtained all of those vast territories which we acquired from Mexico by, to say the least, an equal expenditure of blood and treasure on her part.

I tell these Black Republican leaders, I tell the North, that they may, when it is too late, exclaim, as a celebrated English historian did in reviewing the causes that led to the loss of America to Great Britain:

"What demon of folly got possession of our councils? What malignant star shed its influence on our arms? Where were our statesmen?" All we ask is to be let alone; to be permitted to manage our own affairs; to be protected in the enjoyment of equal rights and equal privileges with the people of the other States of this Union, as well in the Territories as in the States. Believing that all the signs around us point to revolution, that the danger of a dissolution is imminent, and ardently desiring to preserve it, if it can be done consistently with the honor, self-respect, and independence of the people with whom, for good or ill, my lot is cast, I should have a serious responsibility to discharge to my constituents if I did not warn you of the Black Republican party on this floor; and if my humble voice could penetrate even the furthest extremity of the North, I would warn her people not to be deceived by those bold, bad men, who, to gratify their insatiate ambition, would subvert this Government and deluge this land in blood. The people of the South see the dangers that menace them, and they are ready to meet them as becomes the sons of noble sires.

The sentiment, the conviction of the South, is that its safety consists in its unity. Seeing how fiercely we are assailed; that our property, our equality and independence are boldly threatened, we have, day by day, forgetful of past differences, been drawn more closely together, until the proud spectacle is now presented to the world of a free, intelligent people all united as a band of brothers, in the unalterable determination to stand or fall together in defense of their rights. And this I may say, without boasting, that if the madness of fanaticism shall at last compel us, in defense of all we hold most dear, to imitate the example of our great forefathers, when chains and slavery were forged for them, we will so act our part that our future historians will not be ashamed to record our deeds.

By what standard do they judge us? by what examples in our past history, in that of the Anglo-Saxon race, do they conclude that the South will tamely submit to occupy, in this Union, the position of inferiority and degradation to which the Black Republicans would subject her? We are the descendants of that sturdy race of patriots who were willing to expose "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor," rather than submit to so much as a tax of threepence per pound on tea. But you think, perhaps, that we are degenerated. It did not appear so in the war of 1812. It did not appear so with that little band of Texans, who, in defense of their rights and liberties, bravely dared to meet the powerful armies of Mexico. What though we be few in numbers, we still possess all the elements of strength to sustain ourselves in peace or in war; and profane as well as sacred history teaches us that the race is not always to the swift, nor the battle to the strong.

The North is as much, if not more, interested in preserving this Union than are we of the South. Its destiny is in her hands. She now threatens to conquer and subdue us if we dare resist her encroachments. Remember that the same was done by Lord North and his minions towards our forefathers. See what that old Tory, Dr. Johnson, said in an article, "Taxation no Tyranny," written about that time:

"When subordinate committees oppose the decrees of the general Legislature with defiance, thus audacious, and malignity thus acrimonious, nothing remains but to conquer or yield; to allow their independence or reduce them by force." * * * "It seems determined by the Legislature that force shall be tried. I would wish that the rebels may be subdued by terror, rather than by violence; that such a force may be tried as might take away not only the power but the hope of resistance. Their obstinacy may perhaps be mollified by turning the soldiers to free quarters, forbidding any personal cruelty or hurt." * * * "Since the Americans have made it necessary to subdue them, may they be subdued with the least injury possible to their persons and possessions."

You of the North ridicule the idea of a dissolution for any cause. So did, then, the ministers of England. You presume upon your strength and our supposed weakness. So did they with the colonies. The tyrants of old England sought to tax them while they had no voice, no representatives in Parliament. Our brave forefathers determined to put all to the hazard rather than submit even to the smallest tax thus imposed. The Black Republican party proclaim their determination to rule the South by their overwhelming sectional majorities. We, it is true, might have a nominal participation in the legislation of the country, but would be powerless to protect ourselves, and the heaviest burdens might, and, judging by the past, would be imposed upon us. Would the South submit? Would freemen ever submit to occupy such a position?

We do not believe that the North would submit to this under similar circumstances. We have the declaration of Mr. Fillmore, that they would not, and his opinion that they ought not. I have much mistaken the proud spirit of those with whom I dwell, if they shall prove themselves more submissive. Our fathers were loyal to the mother country—so have we ever proved to this Government, discharging all of our constitutional obligations.

The tyrants whom our fathers then opposed, sought to excite insurrection among our slaves—it is so declared in the Declaration of Independence. So do these Black Republicans. See what Dr. Johnson, in the same article from which I have already quoted, said:

"It has been proposed that the *slaves should be set free*, an act which the lovers of liberty surely cannot but commend. With fire arms for their defence, utensils for husbandry, and settled in some simple form of government, they may be *more grateful and honest than their masters*."

Men of the North! remember, that these words were applied to your ancestors, as well as to ours!

But again, says the same author:

"We are told that the *subjection of America* may tend to the diminution of our liberties, an event which none but very perspicacious politicians are able to foresee. If slavery be thus fatally contagious, *how comes it that we hear the loudest yelps for liberty among the drivers of negroes?*"

Our fathers bore long the oppressions of the mother country. The minions of power fondly dreamed that as they had submitted so long, they would never resist. So think our enemies now. Says the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. FARNSWOTRH.] why do not these braggarts put their threats in execution? It is all threat and gasconade. Sir, we make no threat—it is not our aim to frighten anybody: nor can you frighten or deter us from doing our duty.

In times like these, Mr. Chairman, when sectional feeling is so intensely excited, it is impossible to tell what a day may bring forth. And what does all this portend? Is it, or not, the beginning of *revolution*? We short-sighted mortals are not permitted to lift the vail and see what the future has in store for us. Could we do so now, it might serve to check those who are rushing headlong upon unseen dangers. If "coming events cast their shadows before"—if effects still follow causes—if history, that tells us how other republics have risen, flourished for a time, and then passed away; how empires, once hoary with age, and mighty in prowess, at last fell—if she teaches any lessons for our guidance in the story of the past, then ought not gentlemen to be warned?

Our fathers met to consult in the first American Congress in 1774. They separated with no movement made for independence. Again they met, consulted, and went to their several homes, and still no serious talk of independence. Blood had then been shed, too, at Concord, Lexington, and Bunker Hill. They met again in 1776, deliberated, and at last determined on that memorable Declaration of Independence. The Abolitionists and Black Republicans repeat in our ears every day one passage contained in that instrument, and affect to believe that it was intended to include the slaves as well as whites; and therefore sustains their nefarious purposes. I beg to call their attention to another passage, which has not, perhaps, wholly lost its significance:

"That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, (for which it was created,) it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing it in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

Our forefathers were not unsustained in the trying times of the Rev-

olution. They had friends in England who boldly and eloquently defended their cause, and warned the British ministers of the consequences of their rashness. Among them were Lord Chatham, Burke, Fox, Pownall, and Colonel Barré.

Said the latter gentleman, on the floor of Parliament :

"I prophesied, on passing the stamp act, in 1765, what would happen thereon; and I now, in March, 1769, fear I can prophesy further troubles: that if the whole people were made desperate, finding no remedy from Parliament, the whole continent will be in arms immediately, and perhaps these provinces lost to England forever."

In February, 1769, said Governor Pownall in Parliament :

"The Americans do universally, unitedly, and unalterably declare, as I have before told the House, that they ought not to submit. The slightest circumstance will now, in a moment, throw everything into confusion and bloodshed. That spirit which led their ancestors to break off from everything which is near and dear to the human heart, has but a slight sacrifice to make at this time; they have not to quit their native country, but defend it; not to forsake their friends and relations, but to unite with and stand by them in one common union. They will abominate as sincerely as they now love you. In one word, if this spirit of fanaticism should once arise upon the idea of persecuting these people, you will not, for the future, be able to govern with a rod of iron.

"If it be not the humor of the House to believe this at present, I only beg they will remember that it has been said, and that they were forewarned of it."

How applicable to our own times !

Lord Chatham said :

"When the resolution was taken in this House to tax America, I was ill in bed; if I could have endured to have been carried in my bed, so great was the agitation of my mind for the consequences, I would have solicited some kind hand to have laid me down on this floor, to have borne my testimony against it."

Again spoke Lord Chatham :

"America, if she falls, will fall like the strong man. She would embrace the pillars of the State and pull down the constitution along with her."

Again, when he spoke those words that made the tyrants tremble :

"America (says he) is almost in open rebellion. I rejoice that America has resisted."

But all these warnings were unheeded to the last.

I know not upon what to rest the hope that the North will at last yield to wiser and more moderate counsels. All the old national parties are broken up, save the Democratic party, and that is weakened by desertion and torn by divisions. I do yet fondly hope that this old party will be found strong enough, patriotic and self-sacrificing enough, to meet boldly this question, upon which its fate and the fate of the Union depend, and once more restore peace and quiet to a distracted country. It has received accessions of late from the old Whig and the American parties, and forms a nucleus around which the conservative

men of the whole country may still rally. Though deserted by those once recognized as its leaders, a portion of the old guard, the true-hearted Northern Democracy, still stands firm. Though their motives may be maligned, their names threatened to be cast out as despised, and public honors denied them, still, unmoved, they go on to the discharge of their duty to their country. I listened with delight to the manly and eloquent speech of the gentleman from Connecticut, [Mr. BISHOP,] the other day. While the spirit which he exhibited survives among the northern Democracy, though they may, for a time, be in a minority, we may yet have hope for the perpetuity of our institutions. All honor to them! They will yet be honored and sustained at home, cherished and respected at the South; while they will be ever cheered with the pleasing consciousness of having, like patriots, discharged their duty boldly, notwithstanding the desertion of the Douglasses, the Walkers, the Forneys, the Bancrofts, and others, once honored leaders. One of these was, but yesterday, the idol of every Southern heart; the hero of many a forensic contest; the example first on the lips to refute the charge that the northern Democracy were not to be trusted. All remember how, like Saladin's, his keen Damascus blade shone so brightly on many a field in defence of the constitutional rights of the South. Admiring friends looked forward to the day when they could elevate him to the Presidency of the nation—an honor which had only been delayed yet a little while, as they deemed, for an older, though not, as they then knew, a better soldier. That he should so suddenly turn his back upon his ancient friends, and join his long embittered foes, is strange—unaccountable—unnatural.

A striking example in our early history is recalled to my mind. It is of one who was among the boldest and bravest in the early days of our Revolution—daring, resolute, and zealous in the cause of liberty. His blood was freely shed for the great cause. The Father of his Country trusted him, leaned upon him; and yet he, at last, from ambition or some secret griefs, proved himself a traitor to his country. Remembering the past as I do, I will not call him, to whom I have referred, by so harsh a name—but from present appearances, from his quick nomination in the West for the Presidency, with the faithless Robert J. Walker on the same ticket for Vice President; from the indications given out by his organ at Chicago, and from his late speech in opposition to the South, in which, to make friends, as it seemed, with the Black Republicans, he joins with them in grossly misrepresenting the positions of our section; —it will not surprise me to see, very soon, the mask thrown off, and this unnamed chief fighting in the ranks of his late revilers.

We of the South are represented as being desirous of extending slavery to the free territory of the North. This is not so. We claim the right to carry our slaves into territory belonging alike to all the

States. The gentleman from Illinois, (Mr. F.) says he admits this principle as regards all property save that of slaves. He denies that slavery exists by the common law, but contends that it is by statute law only; and denies that this property should be taken to any of the Territories of the Union.

I tell that gentleman that this is no longer a question for dispute. It is the law of the land, so pronounced by the highest judicial tribunal in our country. It was also decided by twelve of the ablest judges in England—among whom was Lord Holt—"that negroes were merchandise." I refer the gentleman to Burges's Commentaries, vol. 1, p. 735; Chalmers's Opinions of Eminent Lawyers, vol. 2, pp. 262, 263, 364; and Colquhoun on Roman and Civil Law, not having time to read them now.

We do not ask you to regard slavery as we regard it. It is not suited to your northern clime, but it is suited to ours. We of the South believe that it is recognized and sanctioned by the Almighty in his revealed Word. We think its introduction into our country has been the efficient means of civilizing and Christianizing the African race. We know them to be happy and contented. Agriculture, commerce, and manufactures, have all derived benefits incalculable from this institution. By it the world has been clothed and fed. Think of it as you will, but deny to us none of our constitutional rights; cease to molest us, and we may yet live on in peace. We are content to assume all its responsibilities, both here and hereafter, and are willing to abide the enlightened public opinion of the world. And may we not hope that there is sufficient virtue, intelligence, and patriotism, at the North to correct this unsound public sentiment? or shall treason, folly, and fanaticism, be permitted to rule the day, and this Republic, with all its present greatness, and its glorious promises, be destroyed, merely to gratify the thirst for power of those Black Republican leaders, in whose hearts, as I believe, there lurks treason as dark as ever actuated the blood-bound associates of Catiline's conspiracy. They, too, meditated an insurrection of the slaves in the Roman territories, as one of their means of effecting their unholy purposes. Cicero, after detecting their plot and arresting their persons, boldly asked, if they deserve praise who laid the foundation of the republic, do not we also who preserved it from its enemies? May not those now (and I allude particularly to those residing in the North,) who unite to restore peace to this distracted country, by preventing the triumphs of treason and rebellion in Kansas, and by thwarting the designs of the enemies of the Constitution and the Union, ask in the same spirit if they, too, have not deserved well of their country?

